P.R. No. 6797/06
Presented by Shri S. Saiswal
dated 23-11-06

SINGLE BENCH

CF 1002

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 6600 /2006

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

PETITIONER

M/s SK. Sarawagi and Company (Pvt) Limited, Chirpurpalli, District Vijaynagram Andhra Pradesh, through K.V. Raghav Raju, aged about 64 years, son of Shri K.C.V. Raju, General Manager and Power of Attorney resident of SonN-Sea Apartment, Flat No. B-304, East Point Colony, Visakhapatnam – 17 (A.P.)

RIC 27/11/06
Clerk
THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through – the Secretary, Department of Mines and Minerals, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

27/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2. Union of India, through – Secretary, Ministry of Mines, Government of India, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.

3. The Competent Authority / Revisional Authority, Ministry of Mines, Government of India, Shastri Bhawan New Dehli

27/11/06

4. M/s. Pushap Steel and Mining Limited, 751, Ground Floor, Kundewala Street Ajmeri Get, New Dehli.

5. M/s. Singhal Enterprises c/o. Collector, District Kanker (C.G.)'

6. The Collector, District Kanker (C.G.)

The Petitioner, named above, respectfully submits as under:-

XI-HC-22

(172)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 6600/06 **सन्** **200**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	29.11.2006 Shri Prashant Jayaswal, Senior Advocate with Shri Ali Asgar, counsel for the petitioner. Smt Anju Ahuja, Dy GA for respondents No.1 & 6/State. Shri Bhisma Kinger, counsel for respondent No.2/Union of India. None for respondents No.3 to 5. Un-disputedly, the dispute was earlier raised by the petitioner by filing WP No.5620/2006 and the same was disposed of vide order dated 06.11.2006 with a direction to the revisional authority - respondent No.3 to dispose of the revision expeditiously. Now, again on the same cause of action, this writ petition has been filed because the revisional authority has not so far been able to dispose of the revision. Although learned counsel for the petitioner contended that Union of India without deciding the revision again adjourned it on 15.11.2006, inspite of that, in my opinion, once the writ petition has been disposed of, on the same cause of action no further writ petition lies; therefore, the instant petition is not maintainable. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed. However, petitioner if advised, may get modification of earlier order dated 06.11.2006. Sd/- V.K.Shrivastava Judge	

padma

(पीछे देखिये)

2-12-06